

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/619,606

Applicant(s)

SAKAMAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Toan Ton

Art Unit

2871

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Toan Ton.

(3) Jesse Collier.

(2) Thoi V. Duong.

(4) Stephen Rotz

Date of Interview: 02/11/03

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: USPN 3,870,517 of Ohta et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed to amend the claims to incorporate recitations such as no liquid medium, first and second steps. It seems that such amendment overcome the prior art of record. Further consideration and search are needed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required